

**GREGORY JEROME MILLER,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CAROLINAS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM,**

**Defendant.**

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court on “Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss for Failure to Prosecute or, in the Alternative, Motion to Compel Plaintiff’s Deposition Attendance,” (Doc. No. 36), “Defendant’s Motion to Extend Remaining Deadlines,” (Doc. No. 38), and the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”), (Doc. No. 41), recommending that Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss be granted, and Defendant’s Motion to Extend Remaining Deadlines be denied as moot. The parties have not filed objections to the M&R and the time for doing so has expired. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2).

Neither party has objected to the Magistrate Judge’s statement of the factual and procedural background of this case, and the Court thus adopts the facts as set forth in the M&R.

The district court may assign dispositive pretrial matters pending before the court to a magistrate judge for “proposed findings of fact and recommendations.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The Federal Magistrate Act provides that “a district court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations

to which objection is made.” Id. at § 636(b)(1)(C); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). However, “when objections to strictly legal issues are raised and no factual issues are challenged, de novo review of the record may be dispensed with.” Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Similarly, de novo review is not required by the statute “when a party makes general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.” Id. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

### **III. DISCUSSION**

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a district court judge shall make a de novo determination of any portion of an M&R to which specific written objection has been made. FED. R. CIV. 72(b). No objection to the M&R having been filed, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issue covered in the M&R. Nevertheless, this Court has conducted a full and careful review of the M&R and other documents of record and, having done so, hereby finds that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is, in all respects, in accordance with the law and should be approved. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as its own.

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge’s M&R, (Doc. No. 41), is **ADOPTED**.
2. Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, (Doc. No. 36), is **GRANTED**.

3. Defendant's Motion to Extend Remaining Deadlines, (Doc. No. 38), is **DENIED AS MOOT.**

4. The clerk is directed to close this case.

Signed: July 8, 2015

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert J. Conrad, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
United States District Judge

